



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,060	06/13/2000	Tatsuya Eguchi	52178-020	5731

20277 7590 11/20/2003
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY
600 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER

EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/593,060

Applicant(s)

EGUCHI ET AL

Examiner

Patrick N. Edouard

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 29, 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1, the limitation “by same language group” is vague and indefinite. It is unclear whether the limitation “by same language group” refers to the plurality of languages or something else. Also the limitation “by group” on line 17 is vague and indefinite because it does not define the metes and bounds of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2654

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1- 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi et al (5,701,497) in view of .

As per claim 1, Yamauchi et al teach a translating apparatus comprising:

“Translating means for translating document data into another language” (figure 1, his translator 9, col. Col. 7, lines 41-54,

‘An output means for outputting the translated document data translated be said translating means” (col. 4, line 36 to col. 5, line 11, figure 1, his bit map exp 10 and his plotter 11);

“ a mode setting unit for setting the translating apparatus in a first mode or a second mode” (col. 4, lines 36-60, his mode selector for activating either the first output or the second output means);

“ a controller, (col.,7, lines 55-56, the system includes a system controller for controlling each unit); wherein in a case where the first mode is set, said controller controls translating means so as to translate the document data and to output the translated document (col. 4., lines 36-60, (when the first mode is activated, the first output means will output the received document in the first language and the second output will output the received document in the second language). the system will output the translated into a plurality of languages, and controls said output unit so as to output the translated document data by same language group”; and

Art Unit: 2654

“ wherein in a case where the second mode is set , said controller controls said translating means so as to translate the document data”(when the second output means is activated the output means will output the received simultaneously in said first language and second language” .

It is noted that Yamauchi et al teach the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach translating the received document into a plurality of languages. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Flores et al teach an apparatus for translating an original text into a plurality of languages in figure 4, col. 5, lines 27-57. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to translate the received document as taught Yamauchi into a plurality of languages because it would be beneficial to monolingual and multi-lingual users attempting to find or create a particular work for content comparison in multiple languages.

As per claim 2, Yamauchi et al teach wherein said output includes a printing device for printing the translated document in a sheet (figure 1, his plotter 11).

As per claim 3, Yamauchi et al teach wherein said output unit includes a sorter (see his plotter 11 and his sheet out).

As per claims 5-6, the combination of Yamauchi with Flores teaches wherein said output device includes a display “ ; and an operation unit for specifying an original language and a plurality of languages” (Yamauchi figure 1, his bit map exp 10, and Flores’ figure 4).

Art Unit: 2654

3. Claims 6-18 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-5 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

4. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 305-9508. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Application/Control Number: 09/593,060


Page 6

Art Unit: 2654

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

November 3, 2003


PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER